



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NEUTRALIZATION.

BY ERVING WINSLOW.

THE method of territorial Neutralization, since it was suggested as a practical and timely peace measure and as a solution of the problems affecting the welfare of the "weaker peoples," has been widely discussed. Its discussion has indicated in many quarters such a misconception of the plan that a renewed definition seems desirable:

"As has been pointed out by writers on international law, neutrality is the creation of the world of Christianity. For the word neutrality the Latin and the Greek have no equivalent. The heathen nations knew nothing but the inveterate exercise of an all-embracing warfare. The idea of limiting the horrors of war to the contending forces by the abstention of neutrals was the product of the new life that was developed by the Renaissance. The statesmen and the lawyers of that time invented for the characterization of the new principle '*neutralis*' and '*neutralitas*,'—linguistic barbarisms, interesting because they prove its novelty. Even in Machiavelli's day the precept of the Florentine seems to have been generally accepted, that a state should never be neutral, because, as he argued, in case the combatants were strong the neutral would become a prey of the conqueror, and in case they were weak the neutral would forego the opportunity to dominate its victorious ally."*

It is to the Nineteenth Century that we owe the practice of Neutralization,—the declaration by the joint action of the Great Powers that a given nation or territory is permanently removed from the field of international struggle. The Powers agree to respect the integrity of the neutral nation, while it, in turn, agrees neither to make war nor to take part in the wars of others.

"A nation set apart and neutralized is bound, as the authorities assert, 'to avoid in times of peace every engagement which might prevent its observing the duties of neutrality in time of war.' As an independent state it may lawfully exercise in its intercourse with other states all

* Report of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress, Boston, 1904.

the other attributes of external sovereignty. It may form treaties of amity and even of alliance with other states, provided it does not thereby incur obligations which, though presumably lawful in time of peace, would prevent its fulfilling the duties of neutrality in time of war. Under this distinction, treaties of offensive alliance applicable to a specific case of war between any two or more powers, or guaranteeing their possessions, are, of course, interdicted to the presumably neutral state, but this interdict does not extend to defensive alliances formed with other neutral states for the maintenance of neutrality of the contracting parties against any power by which it might be threatened with violence.”*

The Neutralization of Switzerland in 1815, which followed the fall of Bonaparte, concerned an established nationality and was intended primarily to secure the peace of Europe. The welfare of Switzerland was not so much considered by the Great Powers as their own safety when they closed that pathway to the march of armies. Similarly, the conditions of perpetual neutrality imposed upon the kingdom of Belgium by the Treaty of London in 1839 were not primarily designed to promote Belgium's welfare, but to create a barrier between France and Germany.

The intrinsic benefits of Neutralization to the protected state and the claim which the “weaker peoples” are entitled to make for the opportunity which it affords for self-development make the new aspect in which neutrality, called by Whewell “the true road to perpetual peace,” is to-day regarded. Thus, F. de Martens writes:

“Dans les temps passés, et particulièrement au commencement du XIXe siècle, la neutralisation d'un petit Etat comme la Suisse était généralement regardée comme un cadeau que lui faisaient les grandes Puissances de l'Europe. A présent, la déclaration de la neutralité permanente devrait être reconnue comme la manifestation d'un droit individuel ou personnel de l'Etat: c'est la pacification perpétuelle et solennelle d'un Etat. Plus il y a de nations permanentes neutres, mieux le règne de la Paix dans les relations internationales est assuré. Plus grand est le nombre d'Etats neutralisés, plus seront restreintes les limites des conflits sanglants entre les peuples.”†

The Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress in Boston referred to the “Bureau International Permanent de la Paix,” for study and report, the subject of the further Neutralization of territories,—a subject quite distinct from the Neutralization of mari-

* Report of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress, Boston, 1904.

† “*La Revue des Deux Mondes*,” November 15th, 1903.

time routes, canals, or navigable waters. The proposal to urge upon The Hague the Neutralization of maritime routes was introduced into the Peace Congress of Lucerne in 1905, and there defeated, and, though it was carried in the Congress of Milan in 1906, it was opposed by a strong minority. Similar opposition has been expressed by Captain A. T. Mahan* in regard to the protection of commerce during the war on the ground that such Neutralization would remove one of the great deterrents of war,—the anticipation of its wide-spread evils. No such objection could be urged against the permanent Neutralization of territories.

Approaching the subject from the point of view of the "little peoples," we must recognize, not only for the individual but for the nations, that right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which the Declaration of Independence claims. The attitude of the United States has hitherto accorded with the principles of its founders. Popular sympathy has manifested itself heartily all along, in our country, with struggles to preserve national life. Finland and Poland, Greece, Hungary and Ireland, the Boers in South Africa, have found ardent champions here, and their heroes have been our heroes. It is hardly to be believed that one misstep has separated permanently America from her ideals, which are so exactly expressed and fulfilled in the scheme of Neutralization. The warning of the Farewell Address has no pertinence against an entrance into world politics as initiating the measure which is intended to segregate nationalities and to preserve them from complications, disputes and warfare. Indeed, as the repentant sinner may become the shining example of sanctity, the nation that has erred may, by the very noble act of withdrawal and reparation, assume the leadership which was her birthright, in the cause of world peace. Hitherto, the suppression of national life by the Powers which have not deliberately trodden under foot the subjugated country, has been carried on under the forms of tutelage and trusteeship, with a "sphere of influence" and a resident administrator sometimes acting under the mask of a titular native ruler. The English, who began by wringing the life-blood from India, have furnished in modern times brilliant examples of self-denying and painstaking colonial administration, and men like Sir Henry Cotton, Sir Andrew Clarke and Lord Cromer are, perhaps, ac-

* "*National Review*," June, 1907.

according to the powers and abilities of her administrators, the rule rather than the exception. Yet along with all the material advancement, the education and social development of the "wards," it is now very distinctly recognized that the artificial and foreign imposition of authority has fostered rather than diminished the national aspirations, and that the loyalty to foreign government is only skin-deep. The thorough-going tyrant may destroy a nation; the beneficent administrator, by the very conditions of his conduct, decidedly encourages the survival of the national aspirations, while he can give them no hopeful direction, and must finally, indeed, when the crisis arrives, take measures to crush them out, as Mr. John Morley, Liberal of Liberals, made Secretary for India, has so inconsistently felt obliged to do.

The unrest which the foreign-ruled peoples are manifesting, the jealousies among the ruling nations themselves, the expenses of colonial administration which fall upon the masses at home and abroad (while the profits from their exploitation enrich only a few individuals) are progressively impressing themselves upon the public consciousness. Colonies settled by the natives of a country in regions suitable for their domestication are, of course, gradually assuming the real independence to which they inevitably tend, but the unassimilable subjects of the "civilized" nations have no such logical future, while the general diffusion of intelligence, the very gift of the conqueror, supplies the armory with weapons which will inevitably turn, sooner or later, against the most beneficent intruder.

The apparently self-denying ordinance by which the ruler should withdraw from the alien territory, relinquishing all special privileges and leaving it free for self-development under the protection of a general Neutralization, may really be the course of wisdom, of economy and of safety. As for the protected nation itself, if its proper life is to persist and develop, we hardly need to refer to the authority of John Fiske for the warrant that no people ever reached independence through the tutelage of another people.

The recent action of the new Kingdom of Norway, which has applied to Germany, England, Russia and France, asking them to join in the Neutralization of Norway, is a most significant measure. It is understood that Germany, France and Russia have acceded to the request and that Great Britain will undoubt-

edly join with them. A kind of Neutralization had been previously arranged with Sweden, pledging Norway and Sweden against fortifications in the neighborhood of the frontier, and this fact, together with her valuable harbors and largely extended coast, has doubtless suggested to Norway this magnificent opportunity for peaceful development, free from the burdens of militarism. The discussion of the subject of Neutralization in Holland, whatever result may be reached, is notable since the subject has been thus seriously mooted there. Japan assented to the Chinese Neutralization, though in the flush of her triumph over the power of Russia she has been allowed to violate the pledges made with the United States and other Powers which might have placed Korea in the category of neutralized nations.

It is very interesting at this time to note the fact that the United States, first admitted to the counsels of the Great Powers at Geneva, whatever opinion may be entertained of her participation, began to use her influence toward the Neutralization of "weaker peoples" at the Berlin West-African Congress, where Mr. John A. Kasson, in behalf of the United States, strongly and impressively urged the Neutralization of the territories comprised in the conventional basin of the Congo. He instanced with great effect the distress which had been caused in this continent, during the earlier period of its settlement, by foreign wars, and made a deep impression upon the Congress, which declined, however, to enter into a compact which might in case of war deprive the belligerent of the means of attack; only embodying the principle by way of a somewhat futile suggestion to the parties which might be concerned in a future act of war.

An admirable opportunity is now at hand to apply the principle of Neutralization to the solution of our pressing problems in the Philippine Islands.

To this or any other scheme for relief, however, opposition manifests itself in some such form as the following:

"It is humiliating to know that any American citizen would suggest, or even entertain, the idea that we should rid ourselves of the responsibility for the government of the Philippines, because there happens to be a 'popular apprehension that the United States might become involved in war.' Never in their history have the American people shunned responsibility because of the perplexities it entailed, or the dangers it threatened. Such a suggestion is un-American."*

* Pueblo, Colorado, "Chieftain." July 14th, 1907.

This sentiment is inspired by a spirit of bravado, such as might impel a drunken ship-captain to refuse to throw over ballast and to defy a coming storm. Even imperial England is contemplating events which the impossibility of colonial defence in case of war might force upon her.*

Within a few weeks the withdrawal of Great Britain from her greatest colony, where nationalization is everywhere the rallying-cry of Young India, has been seriously faced in such words as these:

"It is a certainty that the withdrawal of Great Britain would be followed almost instantly by a partition of India among the Great Powers, both of Europe and Asia, who would spring at once—France upon Burma and Eastern Bengal, Russia upon the Northern Provinces, Germany upon Bombay and its hinterland, and China through Nepal upon Bengal proper, which they would regard as grand prizes, securing to them revenue and the monopoly of the vast markets for which they are all hungering."†

We may be emboldened to suggest the panacea of Neutralization to prevent the foreboded catastrophe.

But what is the real drift of public sentiment in regard to the Philippines? Are not the people of the United States almost prepared to grasp the opportunity which is offered them to set a shining example in the promotion of world-peace, while escaping a most embarrassing and compromising situation? This feeling is well expressed in a notable editorial in a leading newspaper, only one of scores of editorials from representative journals all over the country:

"We believe that any American statesman who discovers a way to get rid of the Philippine Islands, with honor to ourselves and justice to them, will be remembered when all the brilliant reputations won in the Spanish war and the crusade against the trusts have been forgotten.

"The memory of this happy statesman will go ringing down the ages with that of him whose name shall be most closely connected with the completion of the Panama Canal. These two achievements would be of almost equal value to the country. One would double our power of national defence by bringing the two coasts under observation of a single fleet. The other would reduce half our exposure to attack by withdrawing an exposed and useless outpost."‡

Should any great leader of the Republican Party be the "happy statesman" to carry through the scheme of neutralizing the Phil-

* "Problems of Greater Britain." Sir Charles Dilke.

† "Spectator," July 13th, 1907.

‡ "Minneapolis Journal."

ippine Islands, all those who have so long labored to promote their independence will gladly permit his name to go "ringing down the ages" with those of the greatest benefactors to their country!

Resolutions calling upon the Government to propose to the Great Powers the neutralization of the Philippines were introduced into Congress at this last session,—in the Senate by Senator Crane of Massachusetts ("by request"), and into the House of Representatives by Representative McCall of Massachusetts and Representative Burgess of Texas. A hearing was given April 6th, 1906, on Mr. McCall's resolution before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, at which Mr. Moorfield Storey made an eloquent and impressive address.*

An important advocacy of the plan of Neutralization is that of the Hon. James H. Blount, a member of the Volunteer Army in the Philippines and a Judge of First Instance in their courts for several years, who has strongly urged it as a solution of the Philippine problem.†

Mr. John Foreman, who has discussed Philippine affairs with so much intelligence and acumen, writes:

"If, when the United States nine years ago destroyed the protecting power of Spain in the Philippine Islands, the United States had practically said to the Filipinos: 'You are henceforth a free people; work out your own destiny. For no nation which has become great was ever made; it made itself. We will from this moment endeavor to persuade all the Great Powers to join us in declaring your independence and neutrality';—if that had been America's attitude, then the world would have hailed such unprecedented mutual self-abnegation, and the Powers might probably have agreed to America's proposal."

But present conditions are to be faced. During these nine years, it must be recognized, every effort, private and official, has been made to destroy the native characteristics, American influence has been established to the exclusion of every other, and American monopoly set up in many forms, while the death-blow to foreign fair trade will come after the spring of 1909. Vested interests have been legalized, and the Islands, of course, have become more and more a sphere of American influence. It is obvious that to escape the responsibility and to persuade the

* Statement of Mr. Moorfield Storey, of Boston, Massachusetts, before the Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

† THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, January 18th, June 21st, 1907.

Great Powers to join in neutralizing the Archipelago, the situation must be met as this great Republic may surely be expected to meet such a situation, nobly and heroically, that withdrawal must be not ostensible but absolute, that concessions made in perpetuity must be cancelled upon just terms, and that our connection with the Philippine Islands should be only that of the other Powers, though as a "favored nation," surely, entitled to the eternal gratitude of a people whose aspirations would thus be magnificently crowned.

ERVING WINSLOW.